REMARKS

The Office Action of August 5, 2010, has been carefully reviewed, and in view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Section 112 Rejections

In the above Office Action, claims 5, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

As set forth above, claims 5, 13 and 14 have been amended to clarify the method being claimed. Applicants have amended the language to more closely follow the description provided in the specification. As such, Applicants submit that the rejection under Section 112 has been obviated.

Prior Art Rejections

In addition, claims 1-3, 5, 11, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Laing (U.S. Patent No. 6,390,381); and claims 1-3, 5, 9-11, 13, 14, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of references.

As amended above, claim 1 is directed to a method for adjusting several parallel connected heat exchangers, comprising the steps of, *inter alia*, detecting for each heat exchanger a specific size of the heat demand of the heat exchanger in a predetermined period by means of a deviation of a desired value, comparing the specific sizes of all heat exchangers with each other; and changing the setting of the

heat exchanger with the specific size displaying the smallest heat demand in a manner which increases the heat demand.

The primary reference upon which the Examiner relies, Laing, discloses a device for balancing heat circuits in large-area heating systems. Heat medium flows through each heat exchanger of the system from an inlet to an outlet. For balancing the individual heating loops, a temperature difference between inlet (feed-line 19) and outlet (return-line 14) of each loop is determined. For this purpose, it is required that a control unit 1 measures the inlet and outlet temperatures of the open circuits. The control unit then controls adjustable valves 4 in such a manner that the longest loop 6 with the lowest outlet (return-line) temperature is completely opened and all other loops are throttled in such a manner that their temperature differences correspond to that of the longest loop 6. See, Col. 2, lines 1-13.

With the embodiment of Laing, however, specific knowledge about the heating system is required. For example, it is necessary to know which loop is the longest and then this information has to be fed to the control unit in some way.

Contrary to the claimed invention, Laing does not disclose or suggest that a specific value is determined for the heat requirement of a heat exchanger, or that this specific value is determined during a predetermined period. In addition, the specific values of all heat exchangers are not compared to each other. Instead, a heat exchanger or a loop is set as a reference point, and the other circuits are set so that this reference point is reached. If, for some reason, it should turn out that this reference point was wrong or things have happened which cause a change of the reference point, for example a change of the sun radiation, the use of a room or the like, this cannot be sufficiently considered for the subsequent control of the supply.

The claimed invention overcomes this drawback by virtue of the features set forth in claim 1. That is, no information is needed about the design or other physical parameters of the exchanger. Rather, only information about the operation behavior is required, and more specifically, information about the heat consumption of each individual heat exchanger. This is done by means of a deviation of a desired value, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that Laing does not disclose or suggest "detecting for each heat exchanger a specific size of the heat demand of the heat exchanger in a predetermined period by means of a deviation of a desired value," as recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the teaching of Laing.

The dependent claims define additional distinguishing aspects associated with the claimed method. Since these dependent claims depend from an allowable independent claim, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the present application are now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is earnestly solicited.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application; the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned counsel for Applicants regarding the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 5, 2010 By: /WLWeinstein/
Wendi L. Weinstein
Registration No. 34456

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620